

Building Code Review Committee Minutes
December 19, 2006

Participants:

-
Bob Robinson, DHS
Mara Snyder, DHS
John Haines, DHS
Doug Brown, Stewart & Irwin
Patty Xidias, Celebration Fireworks II, Inc.
Leon Fisher, Indiana Builders Association
John Shimer, Indiana Petro Marketers Association
Josh Naragon, ICMA
Cory Whitesell, Hannum, Wagle & Cline
John Hawkins, KovertHawkins Architects
David Kish, Purdue University
Michael Koppes, Purdue University
Ralph Gerdes, Ralph Gerdes Consultants
Tim Callas, J&T Consulting
Ron Ritchey, Fire Inspectors Association of Indiana
Sam Bryner, Fire Inspectors Association of Indiana
Doug Mawhorr, IFUA/IFDA
Steve Graves, Executive Director IFUA/IFDA
Ed Rensink, RTM Consultants
Roger Lehman, Evansville-Vanderburgh County Building Commissioner, IABO
Lisa Murray, Hays Murray Castor, rep. TNT
Adam Holman, City of Indianapolis
Jeff Dean, City of Indianapolis
Margie Bovard, Warren Twp Fire Dept.
Jim Murur, Ft. Wayne Fire Dept.
Ken Foster, IFGA
Mark Riffey, Fire Sprinkler Industry
Robert Clark, APA-The Eng. Wood Assoc.

Summary

1. October meeting minutes were approved unanimously.
2. Discussion of proposed code #7 change for fireworks:
 - a. Proposal is to delete portion of 307.5 which classifies consumer fireworks as H-3 occupancy, and insert reference to Chapter 7 of NFPA 1124. Ms. Snyder explained that normally for such a change, the proponent would have to identify every code section affected. Instead, she suggested joint fire code and building code committee discussion prior to going to this detail. Mr. Dean had prepared a matrix that identified the major differences between NFPA 1124, and the 2006 International Fire Code. Mr. Haines had prepared a matrix showing comparisons between NFPA 1124 and the 2003 Indiana Building Code. Mr. Ritchey said the Fire Inspectors Association had briefly discussed this proposal. He said their feeling was to first understand the proposed changes, then discuss with their membership. He reminded attendees that, in general, the Fire Inspectors Association prefers the International Code series, instead of a mixture of different model codes.
 - b. Mr. Gerdes expressed his opinion that NFPA 1124 was not a complete document, and a number of things were undefined. Mr. Mawhorr said the fireworks industry wants to get a general

opinion from the committee and was open to suggestion. Mr. Gerdes asked if the statute requires new buildings to be H-3. Ms. Snyder explained that one avenue is to create a sub-set of the H-3 occupancy that is less restrictive than other H-3 occupancies. For example, the statute does not address the issue of shipping containers and trailers for storage, where NFPA is liberal on this issue. However, the State Fire Marshall has ruled that they cannot be used to store fireworks, because it negates code limitations for Class 1 buildings. This is an example of one of many issues that would need to be resolved.

- c. Mr. Mawhorr said the fireworks industry is asking for the 500-pound limit to be raised before falling into H-3 category. The Industry is flexible to discuss any and all options. They want to be able to sell fireworks safely, and don't want to endanger the public or firefighters. He said NFPA 1124 is an option, but they are not limited to it. He said they were looking at a range of 1,000 pounds to 5,000 pounds to be allowable without falling into H-3. Ideally, they would like less than 3,000 pound gross weight to not have to comply with H-3. He explained that gross weight was easier to quantify than net weight, due to variations in different products. He suggested using gross weight, assuming 25% of weight is net weight.
- d. Steve Gray said a benefit of NFPA 1124 is that it gets away from the weight issue. He said weight is difficult for a fire inspector to enforce due to the difficulty of measuring. He said NFPA 1124 provides shelving requirements and floor considerations for display. He prefers a code that is easier for fire officials to enforce, and establishes requirements for safe display of fireworks.
- e. Mr. Gerdes asked about the testing that was used to establish the NFPA 1124 requirements. Mr. Mawhorr explained that testing was done in New Mexico last year, using full-scale mock-ups. They are currently reviewing the results. His understanding is that the firebreaks and fuse covers required by NFPA 1124 greatly limited the spread of the fire.
- f. Mr. Kish felt keeping a single classification of H-3 would be easier to understand and enforce than setting up another set of rules. He questioned how much of a hazard 500 pounds represents. Mr. Mawhorr said ICC did not consult the fireworks industry when the 500-pound rule was established. He said a key issue is time to exiting, because the materials burn very rapidly. 5,000 pounds would equate to 1,250 pounds of actual fireworks material, and is a safe amount, in his opinion.
- g. Ms. Snyder explained that portions of NFPA 1124 could be taken as amendments to the Indiana Code by obtaining permission from NFPA.
- h. Mr. Gerdes and Mr. Dean discussed the larger issue of whether fireworks stores should receive leniency from the Indiana Building Code, and what factual basis exists for easing the restrictions. Mr. Gerdes suggested the change would ostensibly be based on the New Mexico tests, and asked for more definitive information. Mr. Lehman agreed that he would need to see scientific data before he would be in favor of changing the model code.
- i. Mr. Brown stated that Celebration Fireworks' stores are fully compliant with the building code, and he and his clients are not asking for the change to NFPA 1124. Lisa Murray, representing TNT said they were an advocate of NFPA 1124, but are concerned about 7.10.5 (4), because it would eliminate their ability to sell fireworks in the big box stores as they now do.
- j. Mr. Riffey noted that it appeared to him that NFPA 1124 appeared to have better rules for display than the ICC codes.

k. Clarified one vote per organization / company.

1. On the question of whether to look at NFPA 1124 further, or deny the proposed code change and look at specific amendments to the model code (building and fire), Mr. Ritchey moved to table adoption of 1124 and move forward with the ICC model codes; seconded by Mr. Callas. Motion carried with one nay.

Note: at the conclusion of the NFPA 1124 discussion the members of the fire code committee were excused. The business of the building code committee continued.

3. Ron Ritchey asked about Indiana amendment to 310.2. October minutes reflect that the Committee decided to abandon the Indiana amendment and propose the model code language, but the committee did not specifically discuss Bed and Breakfast Establishment. Language in item (e) 1 about Bed and Breakfast Establishment to remain in Indiana Amendment, but items (e) 2 and (e) 3 regarding Congregate Residences and Congregate Living Facilities to be deleted. Mr. Koppes pointed out proposed change to Mechanical Code refers to 10 or fewer. This needs to be changed to 16 or fewer to avoid conflict with Building Code.
4. Proposed code change #8 & #9 by Mr. Naragon to alter 403.3.2 to require vertical elevator and stair enclosures to be masonry or concrete in high rises, and create a new section 403.3.3 for shaft enclosures. Discussion about whether the code should dictate a specific material, rather than a performance standard. The language of 403.3.2 would remain intact, but be re-numbered as 403.3.3. A new 403.3.2 would be created requiring concrete or masonry construction. Mr. Naragon stated that ICMA questions that ASTM E119 does not require full time fire rating for gypsum construction walls. Motion by Mr. Naragon to accept both 403.3 code changes as presented, seconded by Mr. Lehman. Motion was defeated 6-8.
5. Proposed code change #10 to delete Exception #2 to 716.5.3, which would then delete smoke dampers at vertical shaft enclosures, proposed by Mr. Rensink. Mr. Ritchey questioned why Indiana allows this amendment. Mr. Koppes said there is much data on both sides of the argument. Mr. Gerdes, Mr. Hawkins, and Mr. Koppes expressed concerns about the expense, maintenance and reliability versus effectiveness. Mr. Rensink explained that this proposal is for vented shafts, and will make the building code consistent with Indiana amendments for the mechanical code. Mr. Robinson has coordinated and corrected section number changes in the Indiana amendments. Mr. Gerdes made a motion, seconded by Mr. Koppes, to accept the change as proposed. Motion carried with one nay.
6. Proposed change #11 by Mr. Rensink, to make the building code consistent with current Indiana mechanical code and NFPA 101 for Health Care occupancies. The change deletes the requirement for smoke dampers in ducted penetrations of smoke barriers, pre-supposing that both sides of the smoke compartment are sprinklered with quick-response sprinklers. Discussion that the proposed change as written does not explicitly require the quick response sprinklers. Mark Riffey said that quick response sprinklers help mitigate the temperature rise and toxic by-products. Discussion that older hospitals could have the option of changing to quick response sprinklers or asking for a variance if they don't have quick response sprinklers. The consensus seemed to be that the proposal should be tabled to allow revision to include the quick response sprinkler requirement. Mr. Kish moved to table. Seconded by Mr. Holman. The motion carried.
7. Brief discussion about fire and police stations are changed to mixed occupancy in 2006 code. Many felt that the current reading is that fire stations are all B occupancies. A proposed change is needed

to review this issue.

8. The next meeting is a joint meeting with fire code committee over chapters 9 and 10. January 23, 2007 at 9:00 am, in conference room 4 & 5.

9. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:57 am.

Prepared by,
John A. Hawkins, AIA